arXiv:1703.02456v1 [math.RA] 4 Mar 2017

A General Algorithm to Calculate the Inverse Principal p-th Root of Symmetric Positive Definite Matrices

Dorothee Richters
Institute of Mathematics and Center for Computational Sciences, Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz, Staudinger Weg 7, D-55128 Mainz, Germany

Michael Lass and Christian Plessl
Department of Computer Science and Paderborn Center for Parallel Computing, University of Paderborn, Warburger Str. 100, D-33098 Paderborn, Germany

Thomas D. Kühne*
Dynamics of Condensed Matter, Department of Chemistry, University of Paderborn, Warburger Str. 100, D-33098 Paderborn, Germany and Institute for Lightweight Design and Paderborn Center for Parallel Computing, University of Paderborn, Warburger Str. 100, D-33098 Paderborn, Germany

(Dated: March 8, 2017)

We address the general mathematical problem of computing the inverse p-th root of a given matrix in an efficient way. A new method to construct iteration functions that allow calculating arbitrary p-th roots and their inverses of symmetric positive definite matrices is presented. We show that the order of convergence is at least quadratic and that adaptively adjusting a parameter q always leads to an even faster convergence. In this way, a better performance than with previously known iteration schemes is achieved. The efficiency of the iterative functions is demonstrated for various matrices with different densities, condition numbers and spectral radii.

I. INTRODUCTION

The first attempts to calculate the inverse of a matrix by the help of an iterative scheme were amongst others made by Schulz in the early thirties of the last century [1]. This resulted in the well-known Newton-Schulz iteration scheme that is widely used to approximate the inverse of a given matrix [2]. One of the advantages of this method is that for a particular start matrix as an initial guess, convergence is guaranteed [3]. The convergence is of order two, which is already quite satisfying, nevertheless there have been a lot of attempts to speed up this iteration scheme and to extend it to not only to calculate the inverse, but also the inverse p-th root of a given matrix [4–8]. This is an important task which has many applications in applied mathematics, computational physics and theoretical chemistry, where efficient methods to compute the inverse or inverse square root of a matrix are indispensable. An important example are linear-scaling electronic structure methods, which in many cases require to invert rather large sparse matrices in order to approximately solve the Schrödinger equation [9–30]. A related example is Löwdin's method of symmetric orthogonalization [31–38], which transforms the generalized eigenvalue problem for overlapping orbitals into an equivalent problem with orthogonal orbitals, whereby the inverse square root of the overlap matrix has to be calculated.

Common problems in the applications alluded to above, are the stability of the iteration function and its convergence. For $p \neq 1$, most of the iteration schemes have quadratic order of convergence, with for instance Halley's method being a rare exception [7, 39, 40], whose convergence is of order three. Altman, however, generalized the Newton-Schulz iteration to an iterative method of inverting a linear bounded operator in a Hilbert space [41]. He constructed the so-called *hyperpower method of any order of convergence* and proved that the method of degree three is the optimum one, as it gives the best accuracy for a given number of multiplications.

In this article, we describe a new general algorithm for the construction of iteration functions for the calculation of the inverse principal p-th root of a given matrix A. In this method, we have two variables, the natural number p and another natural number $q \geq 2$ that represents the *order of expansion*. We show that two special cases of this algorithm are Newton's method for matrices [5–8, 40, 42, 43] and Altman's hyperpower method [41].

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section II, we give a short summary of the work presented in the above mentioned papers and show how we can combine this to a general expression in Section III. In Section IV, we study the introduced iteration functions for both, the scalar case and for symmetric positive definite random matrices. We investigate the optimal order of expansion q for matrices with different densities, condition numbers and spectral radii.

II. PREVIOUS WORK

Calculating the inverse p-th root, where p is a natural number, has been studied extensively in previous works.

* tdkuehne@mail.upb.de

The characterization of the problem is quite simple. In general, for a given matrix A one wants to find a matrix B that fulfills $B^{-p} = A$. If A is non-singular, one can always find such a matrix B, though B is not unique. The problem of computing the p-th root of A is strongly connected with the spectral analysis of A. If, for example, A is a real or complex matrix of order n, with no eigenvalues on the closed negative real axis, B can be uniquely defined [5]. As we only deal with symmetric positive definite matrices, we can restrict ourselves to this unique solution, which is called the *principal p-th root* and whose existence is guaranteed by the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Higham [44], 2008)**.** *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ have no eigenvalues on $\mathbb{R}^-$. There is a unique p-th root B of A all of whose eigenvalues lie in the segment $\{z : -\pi/|p| < \arg(z) < \pi/|p|\}$, and it is a primary matrix function of A. We refer to B as the principal p-th root of A and write $B = A^{1/p}$. If A is real then $A^{1/p}$ is real.*

Remark 1. Here, $p < 0$ is also included, so that Theorem 1 also holds for the calculation of inverse p-th roots.

The calculation of such a root is usually done by the help of an iteration function, since the brute-force computation is computationally very demanding or even infeasible for large matrices. For sparse matrices, iteration functions can even reduce the computational scaling with respect to the size of the matrix because values in intermediately occurring matrices can be truncated to retain sparsity. However, one should always keep in mind that the inverse p-th roots of sparse matrices are in general not sparse anymore, but usually full matrices.

One of the most discussed iteration schemes for computing the p-th root of a matrix is based on Newton's method for finding roots of functions. It is possible to approximate a zero $\hat{x}$ of $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, meaning that we have $f(\hat{x}) = 0$, by the iteration

$$x_{k+1} = x_k - \frac{f(x_k)}{f'(x_k)}. \tag{1}$$

Here, $x_k \to \hat{x}$ for $k \to \infty$ if x_0 is an appropriate initial guess. If, for an arbitrary a, $f(x) = x^p - a$, then

$$x_{k+1} = \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)x_k + a x_k^{1-p}\right] \tag{2}$$

and $x_k \to a^{1/p}$ for $k \to \infty$. One can also deal with matrices and study the resulting rational matrix function $F(X) = X^p - A$ [42], where $F : \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ and F' is the Fréchet derivative of F (cf. [8]). This has been the subject of a variety of previous papers [3–8, 39, 40, 42–48]. It is clear that this iteration converges to the p-th root of the matrix A if X_0 is chosen close enough to the true root. Smith also showed that Newton's method for matrices has issues concerning numerical stability for ill-conditioned matrices [8], though this is not the topic of the present work.

Bini et al. [5] proved that the matrix iteration

$$B_{k+1} = \frac{1}{p}\left[(p+1)B_k - B_k^{p+1}A\right], \quad B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \tag{3}$$

converges quadratically to the inverse p-th root $A^{-1/p}$ if $\|I - B_0^p A\| < 1$, $B_0 A = A B_0$, as well as $\rho(A) < p + 1$ holds. Here, $\rho(A)$ is the spectral radius, which is defined as the largest absolute eigenvalue of A.

In his work dated back to 1959, Altman described the hyperpower method [41]. Let V be a Banach space, $A : V \to V$ a linear, bounded and non-singular operator, while $B_0 \in V$ is an approximate reciprocal of A satisfying $\|I - AB_0\| < 1$. For the iteration

$$B_{k+1} = B_k(I + R_k + R_k^2 + \ldots + R_k^{q-1}), \tag{4}$$

the sequence $(B_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ converges towards the inverse of A. Here, $R_k = I - B_k^p A$ is the k-th residual. Altman proved that the natural number q corresponds to the order of convergence of Eq. 4, so that in principle a method of any order can be constructed. He defined the optimum method as the one that gives the best accuracy for a given number of multiplications and demonstrated that the optimum method is obtained for $q = 3$.

To close this section, we recall some basic definitions, which are crucial for the next section. In the following, the iteration function $\varphi : \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is assumed to be sufficiently often continuously differentiable.

Definition 1. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be an iteration function. The process

$$B_{k+1} = \varphi(B_k), \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots \tag{5}$$

is called *convergent to* $Z \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, if there exists a constant $0 < c < 1$, so that for all start matrices $B_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ with $\|I - B_0 Z\| \leq c$, we have $\|B_k - Z\| \to 0$ for $k \to \infty$.

Definition 2. A *fixed point* Z of the iteration function in Eq. 5 is such that $\varphi(Z) = Z$ and is said to be *attractive* if $\|\varphi'(Z)\| < 1$.

Definition 3. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be an iteration function with fixed point $Z \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. The iteration function in Eq. 5 is called *convergent of order* $q \in \mathbb{N}$, if there exists a constant $0 < c < 1$, so that for all start matrices $B_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ with $\|I - B_0 Z\| \leq c$ we have

$$\|B_{k+1} - Z\| \leq C\|B_k - Z\|^q \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \ldots, \tag{6}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant with $C < 1$ if $q = 1$.

We also want to remind a well-known theorem concerning the order of convergence.

Theorem 2. *Let $f(x)$ be a function with fixed point $x^\star$. If $f(x)$ is q-times continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of $x^\star$ with $q \geq 2$, then $f(x)$ has order of convergence q, if and only if*

$$f'(x^\star) = \ldots = f^{(q-1)}(x^\star) = 0 \text{ and } f^{(q)}(x^\star) \neq 0. \tag{7}$$

Proof. The proof can be found in the book of Gautschi [49, pp. 235–236]. □

III. GENERALIZATION OF THE PROBLEM

In this section, we present a new algorithm to construct iteration schemes for the computation of the inverse principal p-th root of a matrix, which contains Newton's method for matrices and the hyperpower method as special cases. Specifically, we propose a general expression to compute the inverse p-th root of a matrix that includes an additional variable q as the order of expansion. In Altman's case, q is the order of convergence, but as we will see, this does not hold generally for the iteration functions as constructed using our algorithm. Nevertheless, choosing q larger than two often leads to an increase in performance, meaning that less iterations, matrix multiplications and therefore computational effort is required. In Section IV we discuss how q can be chosen adaptively.

The central statement of this article is the following

Theorem 3. *Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be a matrix, and $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ with $q \geq 2$. We define the function*

$$\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$$
$$X \mapsto \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)I - \sum_{i=1}^{q}\binom{q}{i}(-1)^i (X^p A)^{i-1}\right] X, \tag{8}$$

where X has to fulfill $AX = XA$, and we define the iteration

$$B_{k+1} = \varphi(B_k), \quad B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}. \tag{9}$$

If $\|I - B_0^p A\| < 1$ and $B_0 A = A B_0$, then it holds that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} B_k = A^{-1/p}. \tag{10}$$

If $p > 1$, the order of convergence of Eq. 8 is quadratic. If $p = 1$, the order of convergence of Eq. 8 is equal to q.

Remark 2. One can use the same formula to calculate the p-th root of A, where p is negative or even choose $p \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$. However, this is not a competitive method because for negative p, one has to compute inverse matrices in every iteration step and for non-integers the binomial theorem and the calculation of powers of matrices becomes more demanding.

Proof. Now, we prove Theorem 3. To make the representation of Eq. 8 more convenient, we rearrange the following term

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{q}\binom{q}{i}(-1)^i (X^p A)^{i-1} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{q}\binom{q}{i}(-1)^i (X^p A)^{i}\right)(X^p A)^{-1} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{q}\binom{q}{i}(-1)^i (X^p A)^{i} - I\right)(X^p A)^{-1} \\
&= \left((I - X^p A)^q - I\right)(X^p A)^{-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

so that we finally get

$$\varphi(X) = \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)X - \left((I - X^p A)^q - I\right) X^{1-p} A^{-1}\right]. \tag{12}$$

Due to Definition 2, it can easily be seen that $A^{-1/p}$ is an attractive fixed point of Eq. 12 by calculating $\varphi(A^{-1/p})$ and $\varphi'(A^{-1/p})$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(A^{-1/p}) &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)A^{-1/p} - \left((I - (A^{-1/p})^p A)^q - I\right)\right)(A^{-1/p})^{1-p} A^{-1}\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)A^{-1/p} + A^{-1/p}\right] \\
&= A^{-1/p}, \text{as well as} && \text{(13a)} \\
\varphi'(X) &= q(I - X^p A)^{q-1} + \frac{p-1}{p}\left(\left((I - X^p A)^q - I\right)(X^p A)^{-1} + I\right), && \text{(13b)} \\
\varphi'(A^{-1/p}) &= 0. && \text{(13c)}
\end{aligned}$$

To apply Theorem 2, we calculate for our iteration

$$\varphi(X) = \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)X - \left((I - X^p A)^q - I\right)(X^p A)^{-1} X\right]$$

not only the first (cf. Eq. 13b), but also the second derivative

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi^{(2)}(X) = &- pq(q-1)X^{p-1} A (I - X^p A)^{q-2} \\
&+ q(1-p)X^{-1}(I - X^p A)^{q-1} \\
&+ (p-1)X^{-p-1} A^{-1}(I - X^p A)^q \\
&- (p-1)X^{-p-1} A^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

We have already seen that $\varphi'(A^{-1/p}) = 0$ for every p, but for the second derivative it holds that

$$\varphi^{(2)}(A^{-1/p}) = 0 \iff p = 1. \tag{15}$$

It is also possible to show that $\varphi^{(j)}(A^{-1/p}) = 0$, if and only if $p = 1$ for $j = 3, \ldots, q-1$, since

$$\varphi^{(j)}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{j} J_{i,j}(I - X^p A)^{q-i} + (p-1)J_j X^{1-p-j}A^{-1}, \tag{16}$$

where $J_{i,j}$ and J_j are both rational non-zero numbers. So, we have convergence of an arbitrary order.

This implies that according to Theorem 2, the convergence of the presented formula in Eq. 8 is exactly quadratic for any q if $p \neq 1$. For $p = 1$, we have shown that the order of convergence is identical with q. □

As a trivial consequence, we conclude that a larger value for q does in general not lead to a higher order of convergence. However, in the following we perform numerical calculations using MATLAB [50], to determine the number of iterations, matrix-matrix multiplications, as well as the total computational time necessary to obtain the inverse p-th root of a given matrix as a function of q within a predefined target accuracy. We find that a higher order of expansion than two within Eq. 11 leads in almost all cases to faster convergence. Details are presented in Section IV.

We now show that our scheme includes as special cases the method of Bini et al. [5] and the hyperpower method of Altman [41]. From now on, we deal with Eq. 12 for the iteration of matrices $B_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and define $B_{k+1} = \varphi(B_k)$. We assume that the start matrix B_0 satisfies $B_0 A = A B_0$ and $\|I - B_0^p A\| < 1$. One can show that in that case, it holds $B_k A = A B_k$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (cf. [8]). Thus, we have

$$B_{k+1} = \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)B_k - \left((I - B_k^p A)^q - I\right) B_k^{1-p} A^{-1}\right], \quad B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}. \tag{17}$$

For $p = 1$ and $q = 2$, we get the already mentioned Newton-Schulz iteration that converges quadratically to the inverse of A

$$\begin{aligned} B_{k+1} &= -\left((I - B_k A)^2 - I\right) A^{-1} \\ &= (-(B_k A)^2 + 2B_k A)A^{-1} \\ &= 2B_k - B_k^2 A. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

For $q = 2$ and any p, we get the iteration

$$\begin{aligned} B_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)B_k - \left((I - B_k^p A)^2 - I\right) B_k^{1-p} A^{-1}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)B_k - \left((B_k^p A)^2 - 2B_k^p A\right) B_k^{1-p} A^{-1}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)B_k - \left(B_k^{p+1} A - 2B_k\right)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p+1)B_k - B_k^{p+1} A\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

This is exactly the matrix iteration in Eq. 3 that has been discussed in the work of Bini et al. [5].

We now proceed by dealing with the iteration formula in the case $p = 1$ and show that it converges faster for higher orders ($q > 2$). For that purpose, we take Eq. 17 and calculate for $p = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} B_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)B_k - \left((I - B_k^p A)^q - I\right) B_k^{1-p} A^{-1}\right] \\ &\overset{p=1}{=} \left[I - (I - B_k A)^q\right] A^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

We now prove that this is convergent of order q in the sense of Definition 3.

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_{k+1} - A^{-1}\| &= \|(I - (I - B_k A)^q)A^{-1} - A^{-1}\| \\ &= \|(I - B_k A)^q A^{-1}\| \\ &= \|(I - B_k A)^q A^{-1} A^{-q} A^q\| \\ &\leq \|A\|^{q-1} \cdot \|(I - B_k A)^q (A^{-1})^q\| \\ &\leq \|A\|^{q-1} \cdot \|A^{-1} - B_k\|^q. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Now, we show why the iteration function in Eq. 17 coincides for $p = 1$ with Altman's work on the hyperpower method [41]. For that purpose, we rewrite the $(k+1)$-st iterate B_{k+1} in terms of the powers of the k-th residual $R_k = I - B_k^p A$.

$$\begin{aligned} B_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)B_k - \left((I - B_k^p A)^q - I\right)(B_k^p A)^{-1} B_k\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)B_k - (R_k^q - I)(I - R_k)^{-1} B_k\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p} B_k \left[(p-1) + (R_k^{q-1} + R_k^{q-2} + \ldots + R_k + I)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{p} B_k \left[pI + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{q-1} R_k^j\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Altman, however, proved convergence of any order for the iteration scheme in Eq. 4, i.e.

$$B_{k+1} = B_k(I + R_k + R_k^2 + \ldots + R_k^{q-1}), \quad B_0 \in V$$

when calculating the inverse of a given linear, bounded and non-singular operator $A \in V$. If we take $\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ for the Banach space V, this is identical to Eq. 22 with $p = 1$.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Even if the mathematical analysis of our iteration function results in the awareness that, except for $p = 1$, larger q does not lead to a higher order of convergence, we conduct numerical tests by varying p and q. Concerning the matrix A, whose inverse p-th root should be determined, we take real symmetric positive definite random matrices with different densities and condition numbers. We do this using MATLAB and quantify the number of iterations (#it), matrix-matrix multiplications (#mult) until the calculated inverse p-th root is close enough to the true inverse p-th root. The total necessary computational time using a 2.4 GHz Intel Westmere processor is given in seconds (time).

A. The Scalar Case

First, we assess our program for the scalar case. As the computation of roots of matrices is strongly connected with their eigenvalues, it is logical to study the formula for scalar quantities λ first, which corresponds to $n = 1$ in Eq. 17. We take values λ varying from 10^{-9} to 1.9 and choose $b_0 = 1$ as the start value. For that choice of b_0, we have guaranteed convergence for $\lambda \in (0, 2)$. We calculate the inverse p-th root of λ, i.e. $\lambda^{-1/p}$, where the convergence threshold ε is set to 10^{-8}. In most cases, already a larger value for ε yields sufficiently accurate results, but to see differences in the computational time, we choose an artificial small threshold. Here, one should note that in the scalar case, the computational time is not very meaningful due to its small differences for varying q. In contrast to the matrix case, we do not consider the norm of the residual $r_k = 1 - b_k^p \cdot \lambda$ to compute the error, but the difference between the k-th iterate and the correct inverse p-th root, thus $\tilde{r}_k = b_k - \lambda^{-1/p}$. This is due to the fact that in the scalar case, one can easily get $\lambda^{-1/p}$ by a straightforward calculation. Note that we have not necessarily $|\tilde{r}_k| < 1$, but only $|r_k| < 1$. For the purpose to better distinguishing the scalar from the matrix case, we write in the scalar case b_k, λ, $\tilde{r}_k$, and r_k instead of B_k, A, and R_k.

We choose a rather wide range for q to see the influence of this value on the number of iterations and the computational time. In agreement with our observations in the matrix case, which we describe in the next subsection, there is a correlation between the choice of q, the number of multiplications, the number of iterations and the computational time required. In the following, we elaborate on general rules for the optimal choice of q.

Typically, the number of necessary multiplications and divisions is minimal for the smallest q, which entails the lowest number of required iterations. However, there are cases where the number of iterations is not steadily decreasing for higher q, as for example when computing the inverse square root of $\lambda = 1.5$ (Table I). Nevertheless, we conclude that the best choice is $q = 4$, as we have the lowest number of iterations and multiplications and almost the lowest computational time. In other cases, however, the trend is much simpler. For example, when computing the inverse square root of $\lambda = 10^{-9}$, while varying q from 2 to 8, we clearly obtain the most efficient result for $q = 7$, where the number of iterations, the number of multiplications, as well as the computational time are all minimal (Table II).

Table I. Numerical results for $p = 2$, $\lambda = 1.5$. Optimal values are shown in bold font.

q	time	#it	#mult
2	1.7e−05	5	37
3	1.9e−05	4	34
4	1.7e−05	**3**	**29**
5	1.8e−05	4	42
6	**1.6e−05**	**3**	35
7	1.9e−05	4	50
8	1.7e−05	4	54

Table II. Numerical results for $p = 2$, $\lambda = 10^{-9}$. Optimal values are shown in bold fornt.

q	time	#it	#mult
2	2.7e−05	27	191
3	3.4e−05	17	138
4	2.9e−05	14	128
5	2.6e−05	12	**122**
6	2.2e−05	11	123
7	**2.1e−05**	**10**	**122**
8	2.6e−05	**10**	132

In most of the cases, it is *a priori* not apparent which value for q is the best for a certain tuple (p, λ). It is possible that the lowest number of iterations is attained for really large q, i.e. $q > 20$. To present a general rule of thumb, we pick q from 3 to 8 as this usually gives a good and fast approximation of the inverse p-th root of a given $\lambda \in (0, 2)$. Hereby, we observe that for values close to 1, the optimal choice is in most, but not all cases, $q = 3$ and for values close to the borders of the interval, mostly $q = 6$ is the best choice. This shows that the further the value of λ is away from our start value $b_0 = 1$, the more important it is to choose a larger q.

As can be seen in Fig. 1 for $p = 1$, $\lambda = 10^{-6}$, a larger q causes the iteration to enter the quadratic convergence after less iterations (cf. the Appendix for detailed results). This is due to the fact that in every iteration

$$\begin{aligned} b_{k+1} &= \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1) - \left((1-b_k^p\lambda)^q - 1\right)/(b_k^p\lambda)\right] b_k \\ &= b_k + \frac{1}{p}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{q-1} r_k^i\right) b_k \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$



Figure 1. Residuals for $p = 1$ and $\lambda = 10^{-6}$. The optimal choice is $q = 5$, even though $q = 7$ and $q = 8$ require less iterations, but overall more multiplications.

it is calculated. It can be seen that a larger q leads to more summands in Eq. 23 and therefore to larger steps and variation of b_{k+1}. This also holds for negative r_k, as we have $r_k \in (-1, 1)$ and therefore $|r_k^{i+1}| < |r_k^i|$. However, a larger value for q obviously increases the performance just up to a certain limit. This is due to the fact that a larger value of q implies that b_k^p is raised by larger exponents. Therefore, the number of multiplications increases, which is, especially in the matrix case, the computational most time consuming part. This is why we not only take into account the number of iterations. but also the number of multiplications and the total computational time.

B. The Matrix Case

For evaluating the performance of our formula for matrices, we selected various set-ups with different variables p, q, densities d and condition numbers c. The density of a matrix is defined as the number of its non-zero elements divided by its total number of elements. The condition number of a normal matrix, for which $AA^* = A^*A$ holds, is defined as the quotient of its largest absolute eigenvalue and its smallest absolute eigenvalue. Well-conditioned matrices have a condition number close to 1. The bigger the condition number is, the more ill-conditioned A is. For each set-up, we take ten symmetric positive definite matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{1000\times1000}$ with random entries, generated by the MATLAB function `sprandsym` [50]. This yields matrices with a spectral radius $\rho(A) < 1$. We store the number of required iterations, the number of matrix-matrix multiplications, as well as the computational time for each random matrix. Then, we average these values over all considered random matrices. The threshold is set to $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, while q is chosen between 2 to 6.

By using the sum representation of Eq. 8, i.e.

$$B_{k+1} = \frac{1}{p}\left[(p-1)I - \sum_{i=1}^{q}\binom{q}{i}(-1)^i (B_k^p A)^{i-1}\right] B_k, \tag{24}$$

where the number of multiplications is minimized by saving previous powers of $B_k^p A$. It is evident that the number of matrix-matrix multiplications for a particular number number of iterations is minimal for the smallest value of q. However, a larger q can also mean less iterations, so usually the best value for q is the smallest that yields lowest possible number of iterations for a certain set-up. In general, the number of matrix-matrix multiplications m can be determined as a function of p, q, as well as the number of necessary iterations j and which reads as

$$m(p, q, j) = p + ((q-1) + p)\, j. \tag{25}$$

To fulfill the conditions of Theorem 3, we claim that the start matrix B_0 commutes with the given matrix A. If B_0 is chosen as a positive multiple of the identity matrix or the matrix A itself, i.e. $B_0 = \alpha I$ or $B_0 = \alpha A$ for $\alpha > 0$, respectively, then it is obvious that $AB_0 = B_0 A$ holds and that AB_0 is symmetric positive definite. Also, in the first part of the calculations, we only deal with matrices A that have a spectral radius smaller than 1. If we take $B_0 = I$, then we have $\|I - B_0 A\|_2 < 1$ due to the following

Lemma 1. *Let $C \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be a Hermitian positive definite matrix with $\|C\|_2 \leq 1$. Then, it $\|I - C\|_2 < 1$ holds.*

Proof. It is apparent that $\|I\|_2 = 1$. Let U be the unitary matrix such that $U^{-1}CU = \mathrm{diag}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$, where $\mu_i \in (0, 1]$ are the eigenvalues of C. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|I - C\|_2 &= \|U^{-1}(I - C)U\|_2 \\ &= \|I - \mathrm{diag}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)\|_2 \\ &= \|\mathrm{diag}(1 - \mu_1, \ldots, 1 - \mu_n)\|_2 \\ &= 1 - \mu_{\min} < 1,\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $\mu_{\min}$ is the smallest eigenvalue of C. □

In what follows, we want to investigate which parameters are decisive for the optimal choice of q. Specifically, we begin with sparse, ill-conditioned matrices A, where $d = 0.003$ and $\mathrm{cond}(A) = 500$. As can be seen in Table III, for $p = 1$, the number of matrix-matrix multiplications is lowest for $q = 3$, but concerning the number of iterations and the computational time, $q = 6$ is best. For $p = 2$ (cf. Table IV), the situation is rather similar, the least number of multiplications is reached for $q = 3$, even though the minimal number of iterations and computational time is obtained for $q = 5$. For all other considered cases, the optimal q is quite easy to determine. As can be seen in Table V, for $p = 4$, the number of iterations, multiplications, as well as the computational time are all minimal for $q = 4$. The situation is similar for $p = 3$ and $p = 5$, respectively, where $q = 3$ and $q = 4$ are optimal.

Table III. Numerical results for $c = 500$, $p = 1$ and $d = 0.003$. Optimal values are shown in bold font.

q	time	#it	#mult
2	72.7	13	27
3	51.7	8	**25**
4	51.5	7	29
5	48.8	6	31
6	**43.4**	**5**	31

Table IV. Numerical results for $c = 500$, $p = 2$ and $d = 0.003$. Optimal values are shown in bold font.

q	time	#it	#mult
2	71.2	11	35
3	52.2	7	**30**
4	48.6	6	32
5	**44.2**	**5**	32
6	47.4	**5**	37

In general, like in the scalar case, a larger q causes the iteration scheme to reach quadratic convergence after less iterations as can be seen in Fig. 2 for $p = 3$.

For well-conditioned matrices, the situation is quite distinct. For $p = 1$, the optimal value is $q = 6$, while in all other cases, $q = 3$ is best. From this it follows that, by comparing all studied cases, the density does only slightly influence the choice of the optimal q, but the condition number of the matrices is decisive, which can be explained by the fact that the condition number is strongly connected with the spectrum of the matrix.

C. General Matrices and Applications

For many applications in chemistry and physics, the most interesting are sparse and ill-conditioned matrices with an arbitrary spectral radius. Often, to obtain an algorithm that scales linearly with the number of rows/columns of the relevant matrices, it is crucial to have sparse matrices. However, typically these matrices do have a spectral radius that is larger than 1, which is in contrast with the matrices we have considered so far, where $\rho(A) < 1$. Related to this, Bini et al. [5] proved the following

Table V. Numerical results for $c = 500$, $p = 4$ and $d = 0.003$. Optimal values are shown in bold font.

q	time	#it	#mult
2	74.4	10	54
3	50.0	6	40
4	**44.4**	**5**	**39**
5	48.3	**5**	44
6	52.7	**5**	49



Figure 2. Residuals for $c = 500$, $p = 3$ and $d = 0.003$.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that all the eigenvalues of A are real and positive. The iteration function (cf. Eq. 3)*

$$B_{k+1} = \frac{1}{p}\left[(p+1)B_k - B_k^{p+1}A\right],$$

with $B_0 = I$ converges to $A^{-1/p}$ if $\rho(A) < p+1$. If $\rho(A) = p+1$ the iteration does not converge to the inverse of any p-th root of A.

As already discussed, for $q = 2$, the iteration function as obtained by Eq. 17 is identical to Bini's iteration scheme of Eq. 3. Nevertheless, our numerical investigations suggest that the analogue of Proposition 1 may also hold for Eq. 17 for $q \neq 2$.

In any case, in order to also deal with matrices whose spectral radius is larger than 1, one can either scale the matrix such that is has a spectral radius $\rho(A) < 1$, or choose the matrix B_0 so that $\|I - B_0^p A\| < 1$ is satisfied. With respect to the latter, for the widely-used Newton-Schulz iteration, employing

$$B_0 = (\|A\|_1\|A\|_\infty)^{-1}A^\mathsf{T} \tag{27}$$

as start matrix, convergence is guaranteed [3]. However, here we solve the problem for an arbitrary q by the following

Proposition 2. *Let A be a symmetric positive definite matrix with $\rho(A) \geq 1$ and B_0 like in Eq. (27). Then, $\|I - B_0^p A\|_2 < 1$ is guaranteed.*

Proof. As A is symmetric positive definite, we have $\|A\|_2 = \lambda_{\max}$. Due to the fact that $\|A\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\|A\|_1\|A\|_\infty}$ and making use of Lemma 1, we thus have to show that

$$\|B_0^p A\|_2 = \|\left((\|A\|_1\|A\|_\infty)^{-1}A^\mathsf{T}\right)^p A\|_2 \leq 1. \tag{28}$$

Since A is symmetric, we have $A^\mathsf{T} = A$ and therefore commutativity of B_0 and A. Furthermore, the relation

$$(\|A\|_1\|A\|_\infty)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}^2} \tag{29}$$

holds, so that eventually

$$\begin{aligned}\|B_0^p A\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{(\lambda_{\max}^2)^p}\|A^{p+1}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}^{2p}}\|A\|_2^{p+1} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}^{2p}}\lambda_{\max}^{p+1} = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\max}^{p-1}} \leq 1,\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

as we deal with matrices with $\rho(A) \geq 1$. □

Remark 3. By replacing A^T with A^* in Eq. 27, Proposition 2 is also true for Hermitian positive definite matrices.

Consequently, the initial guess of Eq. 27 is also suited for the general case, and not only for the Newton-Schulz iteration. As a consequence, convergence in Eq. 17 is guaranteed for any $p \geq 1$ and $q \geq 2$, regardless of the spectral radius.

In what follows, we perform calculations using matrices A that have the same densities and condition numbers as in the case $\rho(A) < 1$, except for $d = 0.001$. We scale the matrices such that $\rho(A) \in \{10, 50\}$ and use the initial guess of Eq. 27. As before, we find that the best q is independent of the density of the matrix and depends solely on the condition number. Nevertheless, it is important to consider matrices of different densities to observe a general trend. As an example, we study ill-conditioned matrices ($c = 500$) with spectral radius $\rho(A) = 10$ for the case $p = 3$. As can be seen in Table VI, the number of matrix-matrix multiplications, as well as the computational time is always the lowest for $q = 5$, even though the number of iterations is minimal for $q = 6$. However, the decision of an optimal q is not always as simple as in the case demonstrated above. One such instance is the calculation of the inverse fourth root of matrices with spectral radius $\rho(A) = 50$ and condition number $c = 10$. In this case, we observe that for sparse matrices the choice $q = 5$ is the best value, while for more dense matrices $q = 6$ is optimal. The complete results can be found in Table VII. For matrices with a larger spectral radius, we did not observe any configuration where $q = 2$ is the best choice. On the contrary, as can be seen in Tables VI and VII, the evaluation of the inverse p-th root with $q = 2$ generally requires up to two times the computational effort and number of matrix-matrix-multiplications, as well as up to three times the number of iterations with respect to the optimal choice of q. In general, the larger p, the more profitable is a bigger value for q.

Table VI. Numerical results for the case $p = 3$, $\rho(A) = 10$ and $c = 500$. Optimal values are shown in bold fonts.

d	q	time	#it	#mult
	2	406.3	55	224
	3	189.7	23	116
0.003	4	168.0	18	111
	5	**152.9**	15	**108**
	6	153.0	**14**	115
	2	418.0	56	226
	3	198.4	23	120
0.01	4	170.6	18	111
	5	**155.3**	15	**108**
	6	158.5	**14**	115
	2	430.0	57	232
	3	219.4	25	128
0.1	4	189.4	19	117
	5	**179.0**	16	**115**
	6	187.7	**15**	123
	2	529.3	62	250
	3	277.0	27	138
0.8	4	248.0	21	**127**
	5	**235.7**	18	**127**
	6	237.7	**16**	131

Table VII. Numerical results for the case $p = 4$, $\rho(A) = 50$ and $c = 10$. Optimal values are shown in bold fonts.

d	q	time	#it	#mult
	2	240.5	32	166
	3	154.8	18	114
0.003	4	132.9	14	104
	5	**120.0**	12	**100**
	6	**120.0**	**11**	103
	2	251.1	34	172
	3	161.7	19	120
0.01	4	140.2	15	109
	5	134.3	13	**108**
	6	**131.0**	**12**	112
	2	286.7	37	189
	3	187.4	21	128
0.1	4	167.0	16	116
	5	164.9	14	116
	6	**161.5**	**12**	**115**
	2	391.3	43	217
	3	258.7	24	148
0.8	4	224.2	18	**130**
	5	225.3	16	132
	6	**216.0**	**14**	**130**

V. CONCLUSION

We presented a new general algorithm to construct iteration functions to calculate the inverse principal p-th root of symmetric positive definite matrices. It includes, as special cases, the methods of Altman [41] and Bini et al. [5]. The variable q, that in Altman's work equals the order of convergence for the iterative inversion of matrices, in our scheme represents the order of expansion. We find that $q > 2$ does not lead to a higher order of convergence if $p \neq 1$, but that the iteration converges within less iterations and matrix-matrix multiplications,

as quadratic convergence is reached faster. For an optimally chosen value for q, the computational effort and the number of matrix-matrix multiplications is up to two times lower, and the number of iterations up to three times lower with respect to $q = 2$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Max Planck Graduate Center with the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (MPGC). The authors thank Martin Hanke-Bourgeois for valuable suggestions and Stefanie Hollborn for critically reading the manuscript.

[1] G. Schulz, Z. Angew. Math. Mech. **13**, 57 (1933).
[2] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes: The Art of Scientific Computing* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
[3] V. Pan and J. Reif, Proceedings of the 17th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, New York , 143 (1985).
[4] N. J. Higham and A. H. Al-Mohy, Acta Numerica **19**, 159 (2010).
[5] D. A. Bini, N. J. Higham, and B. Meini, Numerical Algorithms **39**, 349 (2005).
[6] B. Iannazzo, Siam J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **28**, 503 (2006).
[7] B. Iannazzo, Siam J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **30**, 1445 (2008).
[8] M. Smith, Siam J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **24**, 971 (2003).
[9] S. Baroni and P. Giannozzi, Europhys. Lett. **17**, 547 (1992).
[10] G. Galli and M. Parrinello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3547 (1992).
[11] R. W. Nunes and D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 17611 (1994).
[12] A. H. R. Palser and D. E. Manolopoulos, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 12704 (1998).
[13] P. E. Maslen, C. Ochsenfeld, C. A. White, M. S. Lee, and M. Head-Gordon, J. Phys. Chem. A **102**, 2215 (1998).
[14] S. Goedecker, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1085 (1999).
[15] T. Ozaki, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 195110 (2001).
[16] F. R. Krajewski and M. Parrinello, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 233105 (2005).
[17] R. Z. Khaliullin, M. Head-Gordon, and A. T. Bell, J. Chem. Phys. **124**, 204105 (2006).
[18] M. Ceriotti, T. D. Kühne, and M. Parrinello, J. Chem. Phys. **129**, 024707 (2008).
[19] P. D. Haynes, C.-K. Skylaris, A. A. Mostofi, and M. C. Payne, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **20**, 294207 (2008).
[20] M. Ceriotti, T. D. Kühne, and M. Parrinello, AIP Conf. Proc. **1148**, 658 (2009).
[21] L. Lin, J. Lu, R. Car, and W. E, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 115133 (2009).
[22] D. R. Bowler and T. Miyazaki, Rep. Prog. Phys. **75**, 036503 (2012).
[23] T. D. Kühne, WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci. **4**, 391 (2013).
[24] R. Z. Khaliullin, J. VandeVondele, and J. Hutter, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **9**, 4421 (2013).
[25] D. Richters and T. D. Kühne, J. Chem. Phys. **140**, 134109 (2014).
[26] S. Mohr, L. E. Ratcliff, P. Boulanger, L. Genovese, D. Caliste, T. Deutsch, and S. Goedecker, J. Chem. Phys. **140**, 204110 (2014).
[27] D. Osei-Kuffuor and J.-L. Fattebert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 046401 (2014).
[28] S. Mohr, L. E. Ratcliff, L. Genovese, D. Caliste, P. Boulanger, S. Goedecker, and T. Deutsch, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **17**, 31360 (2015).
[29] J. Aarons, M. Sarwar, D. Thompsett, and C.-K. Skylaris, J. Chem. Phys. **145**, 220901 (2016).
[30] L. E. Ratcliff, S. Mohr, G. Huhs, T. Deutsch, M. Masella, and L. Genovese, WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci. **7**, 1290 (2017).
[31] P.-O. Löwdin, J. Chem. Phys. **18**, 365 (1950).
[32] J. M. Millam and G. E. Scuseria, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 5569 (1997).
[33] A. M. N. Niklasson, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 193102 (2004).
[34] B. Jansik, S. Host, P. Jorgensen, J. Olsen, and T. Helgaker, J. Chem. Phys. **126**, 124104 (2007).
[35] T. D. Kühne, M. Krack, F. R. Mohamed, and M. Parrinello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 066401 (2007).
[36] S. Schweizer, J. Kussmann, B. Doser, and C. Ochsenfeld, J. Comp. Chem. **29**, 1004 (2007).
[37] E. H. Rubensson, N. Bock, E. Holmström, and A. M. N. Niklasson, J. Chem. Phys. **128**, 104105 (2008).
[38] C. J. Garcia-Cervera, J. Lu, Y. Xuan, and W. E, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 115110 (2009).
[39] E. Halley, Trans. Roy. Soc. London **18**, 136 (1694).
[40] C.-H. Guo, Linear Algebra Appl. **432**, 1905 (2010).
[41] M. Altman, Pacific J. Math. **10**, 1107 (1960).
[42] W. D. Hoskins and D. J. Walton, Linear Algebra Appl. **26**, 139 (1979).
[43] C.-H. Guo and N. J. Higham, Siam J. Matrix Anal. Appl. **28**, 788 (2006).
[44] N. J. Higham, *Functions of Matrices : Theory and Computation* (SIAM, 2008) pp. I–XX, 1–425.
[45] S. Lakić, Z. Angew. Math. Mech. **78**, 167 (1998).
[46] P. J. Psarrakos, Electronic Journal of Linear Algebra **9**, 32 (2002).
[47] A. Ben-Israel, Math. Comput. **20**, 439 (1966).
[48] W. V. Petryshyn, Proc. AMS **16**, 893 (1965).
[49] W. Gautschi, *Numerical Analysis: An Introduction* (Birkhäuser, 1997).
[50] MATLAB and Statistics Toolbox Release 2013a, *Version 8.1* (The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, 2013).